REMARKS

Claims 97-99, 103-109, 112, 113, and 115-128 are pending and stand rejected. In response, claims 97, 120, and 121 are amended. No claims are canceled and no claims are added. Claims 97-99, 103-109, 112, 113, and 115-128 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for her time in conducting a telephone interview on January 15, 2008 with Applicants' representative Brian M. Hoffman and Matthew R. Harvey. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the Office Action dated 11/25/08, the Horn reference (US Patent 7,013,289), the language of independent claims 97, 120, and 121, and the outstanding claim objections. No specific agreements were reached.

Claim Objections

The claim amendments made in the response filed November 19, 2007 were objected to as introducing new matter. Specifically, the phrase "searching an index of articles that describe **retail products**" included in independent claims 97, 120, and 121 was objected to. Claims 97, 120, and 121 are amended herein and now recite "searching an index of articles that describe **products for sale**." Support for the language of the amended claims is found throughout the specification, including, for example, at paragraphs [0017] and [0018]. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request lifting of the objection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 97, 103-105, 107-109, 113, 120-121, and 128 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Horn (US Patent 7,013,289). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 97, 120, and 121 respectively recite a computer-implemented method, a computer program product, and a computer-implemented system for displaying information. In response to a received search query for a product, an index of articles that describe products for sale is searched. An article is determined to be responsive to the search query, and the article includes price information and one or more images of the product. A price for the product is selected from the article, and an image for the product is selected from the article based on the price. For example, claim 97 now recites:

> A computer-implemented method for displaying information, the method comprising:
>
> in response to receiving a search query for a product, searching an index of articles that describe products for sale;
>
> determining, based on the index searching, that a first article is responsive to the search query, the first article including price information for the product and one or more images of the product;
>
> selecting a price for the product from the first article;
>
> **selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price; and**
>
> displaying the price and the image for the product.

Independent claims 120 and 121 also recite "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price."

Horn, in contrast, does not disclose or suggest "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price." Horn describes a global electronic commerce system that includes a multi-language database to provide various language-specific marketing information

to buyers. *See* Horn, col. 13, lines 1-48. However, Horn merely describes the presentation of conventional webpages. Hence, although Horn mentions conventional webpages that include images for products, the images were not "selected" as claimed. The mere fact that an image for a product is <u>displayed</u> on a web page does not imply that the system has <u>selected</u> that image for the product, much less selected the image based on the price. Rather, the conventional webpages described by Horn are simply pre-programmed, or "hardwired," to include the images. *See* Horn, col. 42, line 62 to col. 43, line 45. Hence, Horn does not disclose or suggest at least the claimed feature of "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price."

Based on the above Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons independent claims 97, 120, and 121 are patentably distinguishable over Horn. Additionally, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims 97, 120, and 121 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to their dependent claims as well, including dependent claims 103-105, 107-109, 113, and 128. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 103-105, 107-109, 113, and 128 are also patentably distinguishable over Horn for at least the reason of their dependency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that their rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 98-99, 106, 115-117, 122, and 124-127 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Horn in view of Aggarwal (US Patent 6,728,706) in further view of Venkatraman (WO/0113273)[1]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

---

[1] Applicants note that the Office Action dated 11/25/08 did not explicitly list Horn in the rejection of claims 98-99, 106, 115-117, 122, and 124-127. However, from the manner in which these claims are addressed therein, Applicants believe that Horn was intended to be included and its omission was merely a typographical error. In the interest of providing a complete response, Applicants have responded accordingly.

As claims 98-99, 106, 115-117, 122, and 124-127 depend from independent claim 97, the arguments regarding Horn advanced above with respect to claim 97 are hereby incorporated to apply to claims 98-99, 106, 115-117, 122, and 124-127 as well.

Aggarwal does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Horn. Aggarwal describes searching product catalogs and attempts to improve search results by learning an "implied concept" of a shopper's search activity. *See* Aggarwal, Abstract and col. 3, lines 14-38. Specifically, Aggarwal provides search results by evaluating "similarity functions." *See* Aggarwal, col. 3, lines 62 to col. 4, line 20. A similarity function computes a similarity score for products stored in a product database based on feature of the products. *See* Aggarwal, col. 5, line 64 to col. 6, line 9. For example, a similarity function might compute a similarity score for sedans or t-shirts. *See* Aggarwal, col 10, lines 48-67. Hence, Aggarwal's "similarity functions" are used to select products from a database, not images from an article, and are unrelated to the claimed feature of "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price."

Venkatraman also does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Horn and Aggarwal. Venkatraman discusses searching "for nodes of a stored data structure that satisfy a received search result." *See* Venkatraman, Abstract. However, Venkatraman fails to disclose "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price." Although Figures 1C and 1D of Venkatraman illustrate the display of images on a webpage, these figures do not show "selecting an image for the product from the first article based on the price." Rather, Figures 1C and 1D are merely illustrations of conventional web pages preprogrammed to include images. As stated above with respect to claim 97 and Horn, the mere fact that an image for a product is <u>displayed</u> on a web page does not imply that the system has <u>selected</u> that image for the product, much less selected the image based on the price.

Based on the above Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, dependent claims 98-99, 106, 115-117, 122, and 124-127 are patentably distinguishable over Horn, Aggarwal, and Venkatraman alone or in any combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Allowed Claims

The Office Action dated 11/25/08 stated that claims 118, 119, and 123 are allowable over the prior art of record, which includes Horn, Aggarwal, and Venkatraman. Dependent claims 124-127 depend from claim 123. Applicants therefore submit that claims 124-127 are also allowable over the prior art of record for at least the reason of their dependency.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable because they are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited reference. The dependent claims not specifically mentioned above incorporate the limitations of their base claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully Submitted,
MARK PEARSON ET AL.

Date: February 25, 2009

By: /Brian Hoffman/

Brian M. Hoffman, Reg. No. 39,713
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2484
Fax: (415) 281-1350